

# ACREAGE STUDIES OPEN HOUSE

*NOVEMBER 18, 2003 - 6:30 P.M. TO 8:30 P.M.*

*LOWER PLATTE SOUTH NATURAL RESOURCE DISTRICT*

---

## MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

- ☐ How should we support and finance acreages? Need to balance public dollars.
- ☐ Viewsheds are important and need to be respected and protected.
- ☐ Acreages should be clustered with existing acreages for good orderly growth, not just built anywhere.
- ☐ What is the study's working definition of "acreage?" vs. "working farm?"
- ☐ Tier 1 acreage status - tax issues; assessments; transition to city.
- ☐ There is a great demand for 2+ acre lots in the rural areas.
- ☐ Believe that acreages are paying their way today.
- ☐ Strongly questions consultant's figures used for the "Cost of Services Study"
- ☐ Future outlots in acreage development can help fund improvements - but need to know conversion costs up-front.
- ☐ County impact fees - would they be one time only? Or would there be a second charge when city annexation occurs?
- ☐ Acreage traffic is only known after homes are built so how can impact fees be charged for road construction at time of building permit?
- ☐ Comprehensive Plan projected acreage demand - why does it use a 40 year average? Why not a short time period, like 10 years?
- ☐ It's an established fact that cities show spurts of growth after they reach 200,000 population.
- ☐ Acreage policies should trade-off growth and infrastructure costs.
- ☐ Open space vs. viewsheds.
- ☐ Trade-off of using 3 acre lots vs. 20 acre lots - 3 acres lost consume less land.
- ☐ Performance standards = 300 pts. - shouldn't they be shown as AGR in county? Also should look at lower point threshold to allow for more 3 acre lots.
- ☐ Keep more land in agricultural production - this is supported by "3 acre lot" policy.
- ☐ 20 acre lots are inefficient use of land.
- ☐ Need detail of performance scoring to fully understand its impact - and bottom line costs.
- ☐ What's intended philosophy of acreage policy? What are we trying to accomplish?
- ☐ Market will respond positively to TDR (transfer of development rights) and 3 acre lot policy.
- ☐ How will farmers be protected by these proposals? Is the sustaining of farming really being considered in these proposals?

- ☐ Acreages make farming more difficult.
- ☐ Permanent restriction of TDR - Time of restriction? How long would restrictions on the development of land remain if its development rights were transferred to another location in the County?
- ☐ Is "TDR land" removed from greenbelt? Would the assessed value be impacted? If so, how?
- ☐ Equity of points system - doesn't seem fair. Need to have more land available for development as acreages.
- ☐ Have minimum distribution of future growth - north should get a greater share.
- ☐ Have environmental and water quality and quantity been considerations by the County in these proposed policies?
- ☐ Conservation (esp. trees) areas - how have they been handled?
- ☐ Point system does a fair job of meeting criteria.
- ☐ Need to be aware of conflicts between acreages, farms, and environmental areas.
- ☐ Supports impact fees for acreage development.
- ☐ Goal should be to balance cost of acreages and farming.
- ☐ Was the timing of road construction vs. taxes paid taken into consideration? There is a lag between when a house is build and the county road improved.
- ☐ City's landfill has impacted view of Capitol - need to treat everyone fairly.
- ☐ Trend is toward upscale acreages - need to consider needs of middle income families so that they can live on acreages as well.
- ☐ Existing rural school districts do benefit from acreage development.
- ☐ Lancaster County has a lot of positive trends (residential for sure) and this is expressed in growth of assessed value.
- ☐ Need to do a better job of protecting the farmer - poor policy to have to sell off a portion of their land to stay in farming.
- ☐ Is there an area in the county that can be preserved for those that want to farm?
- ☐ Selling of easements or development rights can help maintain farms - it's done in other states.
- ☐ How was road impact fee calculated?
- ☐ Build-Through Acreages- increase percentage allowed needed for ghost plats - 20% is too low - need to help offset costs of development.
- ☐ Outlots in CUP ( Community Unit Plan) - Is it correct that they can't be developed until urbanization occurs? (I.e., becomes part of city.) (Answer = yes)
- ☐ Can there be a dwelling unit on an outlot? (Answer = no)
- ☐ 20 acre lots drive up cost of land more than smaller lots.
- ☐ When do impact fees apply? When home is sold? Or when a building permit is issued?
- ☐ Need to maintain environmental quality of county.
- ☐ Will 3 acre lots create "wall to wall" urbanization? Need to preserve natural

features and open areas.

- ☐ Were projections made of how many acreage lots will become available if these policies are put in place? When would such development occur? Where would it occur?
- ☐ Capacity and economic issues in Lincoln Public Schools - impact of rural areas and transfer of students.
- ☐ County taxes - what percent comes from city tax payers? County Board should separate funds to have city taxpayers pay for city services and rural tax payers pay for rural services.
- ☐ Smaller lot clusters preserves farmland - we should increase bonus for community systems and reduce use of lagoons.
- ☐ Staff should take the top issues presented tonight and conduct research on options; then present these ideas in a public forum.
- ☐ Frustrated by inconsistently applied rules and policies.
- ☐ If requirements are met, outcomes should be consistent.
- ☐ Alternative to requiring 1-to-3 conversion - rules are too hard and fast.
- ☐ Problem of getting a subdivision plat through process - takes too long.
- ☐ Remove “yellow areas” from Comp Plan land use plan that are in town jurisdictions - distort the picture of available land for acreages.
- ☐ Acreage sales are driving up the price of raw land.
- ☐ Need to review what other jurisdictions are doing to deal with acreage developments.
- ☐ Subdivision standards are too inflexible.
- ☐ Growth is good for some rural districts if they have capacity.
- ☐ Acreage owners need insite to their responsibility - “No Care Attitude”.
- ☐ Dogs are a problem.
- ☐ Need to maintain ditches.

*I:\acreages\Open House Notes.wpd*